

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-17 are now pending.

Claims 1-8 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Japan '709. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 9 and 10 include allowable subject matter. Claims 9 and 10 have been presented in independent form above and are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been canceled and claim 2 has been dependent on newly independent claim 9, so that the Examiner's rejection has been mooted with respect to claim 2. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to the remaining claims as presented hereinabove.

With respect to claims 3 and 4, in accordance with the present invention as claimed therein, the threaded hole is a through hole having a clearance inlet hole. It is respectfully submitted that JP '709 does not anticipate the invention as recited in those claims.

Anticipation under Section 102 of the Patent Act requires that a prior art reference disclose every claim element of the claimed invention. See, e.g., Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc., 806 F.2d 1565, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1986). While other references may be used to interpret an allegedly anticipating reference, anticipation must be found in a single reference. See, e.g., Studiengesellschaft Kohle, G.m.b.H. v. Dart Indus., Inc., 726 F.2d 724, 726-27 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The absence of any element of the claim from the cited reference negates anticipation. See, e.g., Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co., 749 F.2d 707, 715 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Anticipation is not shown even if the differences between the claims and the prior art reference are insubstantial and the missing elements could be supplied by the

knowledge of one skilled in the art. See, e.g., Structural Rubber Prods., 749 F.2d at 716-17.

In contrast to the invention, in JP '709, the threaded hole is not a through hole, and the portion having the threaded hole does not have a clearance inlet hole. In JP '709, a clearance is formed between bracket 15 and the male-threaded portion. However, that clearance does not meet the limitations of applicant's claim. Indeed, the clearance of JP '709 is not defined by the resinous portion into which the screw is screwed. Rather, the "clearance" is defined by a bracket fastened by the threaded component. Thus, the claimed invention is not anticipated. Moreover, the JP '709 structure does not realize the advantages afforded by the claimed structure. For example, the "clearance" in JP '709 does not restrict a portion around the inlet face of the resinous part 7,13 from projecting and cracking when the male-threaded portion is screwed into the resinous part 7,13. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 3 and 4 is not anticipated by nor obvious from JP '709.

Claim 5 provides that the length of the male-threaded portion is shorter than the length of the through hole of the resinous portion, so that the male-threaded portion does not project from the outlet of the through hole when engaged therewith.

As noted above, JP '709 does not provide a through hole. Instead, JP '709 provides only a threaded, dead-end receptacle. Therefore, JP '709 cannot properly be said to anticipate claim 5. Not only does JP '709 fail to disclose a through hole, but JP '709 fails to disclose an assembly wherein a male-threaded portion is shorter than the through hole, so that it does not project from an outlet of through hole in which it is placed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 5 is not anticipated by nor obvious from the applied art.

With regard to claims 6-8, in accordance with the present invention as claimed therein, the female-threaded through hole has a clearance on an its outlet side. As a consequence, the side of the outlet face is not apt to be diametrically widened so that

the female-threaded through hole can be restricted from cracking on the side of the outlet face.

In contrast to the invention as claimed in claims 6-8, JP '709 does not teach a through hole but instead teaches a threaded receptacle. Additionally, JP '709 does not disclose a female-threaded through hole having a clearance on its **outlet** side. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6-8 are not anticipated by JP '709 either.

Claim 11 has been rewritten above in independent form and to make clear that the non-circular shape in cross-section is the shape in transverse cross-section, perpendicular to the axial direction of the male-threaded portion. As recited in claim 12, the non-circular shaped cross-section may be a triangular shaped cross-section.

JP '709 does not depict the transverse cross section of the male-threaded portion thereof. The only shape illustrated is in a direction parallel to the axial direction of the male-threaded portion such that the threaded male portion is tapered and has a pointed tip. Clearly, there is no anticipation of the non-circular cross-section recited in claim 11, much less the triangular shape recited in claim 12, nor any suggestion to the skilled artisan that such a structure could or should be provided. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 12 are also patentable over JP '709.

The Examiner has suggested that because the threads are not themselves in a (transverse) plane, JP '709 has a non-circular cross-section. It is respectfully submitted, however, that all screw threads are ultimately spiraled and, therefore, the Examiner's mis-interpretation of the claim limitations in this regard is inconsistent with an interpretation that would be had by the skilled artisan. Indeed, it is understood that the "shape" of a threaded shaft in cross-section is the shape of the male-threaded portion that would be "seen" when viewed in a plane transverse to the axial direction of the thread shaft. New claim 17 underscores that the screw portion is non-circular in plan

SUZUKI

Appl. No. 10/674,501

June 22, 2004

view to address the thread issue, but it is submitted that a fair reading of claim 11 distinguishes that claim from JP '709.

Newly added claims 13-16 depend directly or indirectly from the above-discussed claims and are submitted to be patentable over the applied art for the same reasons.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: 

Michelle N. Lester

Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100